

## STAP SCREEN

GEF ID	11419
Project title	Artisanal Fisheries Resilient Development Project (PROPEIXE)
Date of screen	January 16, 2024
STAP Panel Member	Ed Carr
STAP Secretariat	Virginia Gorsevski

### 1. Summary of STAP's views of the project

This project (PROPEIXE) seeks to address climate change impacts on artisanal fisheries along the coast of Mozambique through greater use of climate-resilient technologies and practices along the value chain, restoration of degraded ecosystems, and diversification of livelihoods - presumably with the aim of increasing the adaptive capacity of coastal communities.

Overall, the rationale behind this project is sound, with several caveats. First, only one climate future is presented (RCP4.5) and the link between projected changes in temperature and precipitation and the impacts on the fisheries sector is somewhat weak. Related, the relationship and relative importance of climate change to other critical non-climate factors affecting fisheries and livelihoods such as pollution, overfishing, erosion and coastal land degradation and development, sand mining, etc. (both presently and in the future) is lacking.

STAP welcomes the inclusion of the project's theory of change, noting that the logic – particularly the connection between each component and the adaptation benefits it is aiming to achieve – is somewhat weak. Providing more detail about what, specifically, is intended by each intervention (e.g., climate-smart practices and technologies) and the clear connection of each component to adaptation benefits (in this case, adaptive capacity) will greatly improve the project rationale and focus.

*Note to STAP screeners: a summary of STAP's view of the project (not of the project itself), covering both strengths and weaknesses.*

#### STAP's assessment\*

- Concur - STAP acknowledges that the concept has scientific and technical merit
- X** **Minor - STAP has identified some scientific and technical points to be addressed in project design**
- Major - STAP has identified significant concerns to be addressed in project design

Please contact the STAP Secretariat if you would like to discuss.

### 2. Project rationale, and project description – are they sound?

See annex on STAP's screening guidelines.

This is a well-intended, comprehensive project whose objective is straightforward – to address the impacts of climate change on the artisanal fisheries sector through 'increasing the sustainability and climate resilience of fishery value chains through climate technologies and practices, restoration of degraded ecosystems, and diversification of livelihoods in five coastal provinces.'

The underlying rationale is that climate change is impacting artisanal fisheries through extreme weather events such as droughts, cyclones and floods (e.g. tropical cyclones are expected to decrease in number but increase in intensity) as well as ocean warming, which leads to coral bleaching and the disruption of associated fisheries. In addition, RCP4.5 indicates that temperatures are expected to increase by approximately 1.5 – 2 degrees C

depending on location. Changes in precipitation are less clear but show greater variability during the rainy season. In both cases, these figures are for the whole country; however, the project sites are along the entire coastline so it's not entirely clear how fisheries sector in each of these areas will be impacted, though the project claims that one of the criteria for site selection was 'area most affected by climate shock.' Only one scenario is presented (RCP4.5) – STAP recommends including at least one more to capture the uncertainty of future climate conditions.

While the project seeks to build the adaptive capacity of coastal communities to the impacts of climate change, adaptive capacity seems to be loosely equated with assets and income rather than any specific set of climate-related tools or information. The PIF does not clarify how projected changes in temperature and precipitation will specifically affect the fisheries sector, particularly in relation to other (potentially more pressing) issues such as pollution, overfishing, erosion and coastal land degradation and development, sand mining, etc. This connection should be made more explicit.

In addition, several of the barriers listed such as degradation of natural resources are not so much barriers to the achievement of adaptation goals as they are a description of problems the project will confront. Only Barrier 3 contains a clear link between climate change and the fisheries sector, focusing on the vulnerability of the value chain infrastructure to rising sea levels and increased storm intensity.

STAP appreciates the focus on the inclusion of the concept of 'necessary and sufficient' in the PIF though it's not clear the concept is well understood in this context. If the aim is to ensure sustainable fisheries, then this project is necessary because it will help fisherfolk improve their adaptive capacity to potential future extreme weather events. However, it is not sufficient because of the many other problems (potentially more significant) that negatively impact fish stocks and value chains such as those described (overfishing, pollution, coastal development, an insurgency in some planned project areas, etc.). If the aim is for this project to complement other projects that address these problems, this should be articulated clearly as part of the 'necessary but sufficient' rationale. Doing so would support the contention that this project will 'blend seamlessly' with a separate but related IFAD project.

The section marked 'adaptation benefits' is useful in that it clearly articulates the project's view of benefits delivered, but these benefits are not clearly linked to increased adaptive capacity for addressing the impacts of climate change. At times, the connection seems obvious but implicit, which might lead to a mischaracterization of the benefit delivered. For example, mangrove rehabilitation and protection seems more likely to reduce the *sensitivity* of local people, livelihoods, and residences to the impacts of climate change by buffering local fisheries and providing protection from storm surges. The adaptive capacity benefit of such protection is at least a step removed (i.e. enabling steady or greater fish takes will give people more money, which can contribute to adaptive capacity). These important details should be clearly articulated.

Given the myriad of issues facing the fisheries sector in Mozambique, it would be instructive to present this information as part of several future narratives in Section A on project rationale. These narratives develop two or more plausible, integrated futures that account for different possible trends in important system drivers, such as climate change, economic development, demographics, and political factors. The STAP [Simple future narratives brief and primer](#) provides more information on how to construct these. Such narratives are valuable for project designers by allowing for the consideration of different interventions across a range of possible futures to facilitate the selection and design of activities that are robust across many possible futures, rather than just one.

The project includes a theory of change (ToC), including causal pathways and assumptions; however, they are presented separately which makes it difficult to follow. Project components are sensible and respond to the project objective; however, too often they seem to imply an adaptation benefit by calling an intervention or activity "climate-smart" without articulating what is climate-smart about it or how that will result in an adaptation benefit. Each component appears linked to an outcome, but each outcome is not clearly an adaptation benefit. It is not enough to boost incomes to claim that adaptive capacity has been increased. The

project has to explain whose incomes will be increased and how that income will be used in a manner that facilitates new adaptive actions. Perhaps because of this lack of clarity, more specific information is needed to explain what ‘climate-smart practices and technologies’ are in the specific context of this project. For example, many of the technologies/practices in Component 1 are focused on environmentally friendly fishing gear which presumably will help to avoid bycatch and reduce discards – important for fisheries but the connection to climate adaptation is less clear apart from generally supporting sustainable fishing (which would be more appropriately funded by the GEF IW focal area). Another example is the use of solar-powered cooling systems, which seems like a promising intervention but might be more appropriate for Component 2 focusing on value chain development if the aim is to improve post production.

Perhaps because of the conceptual issues above, the ToC diagram is somewhat difficult to follow – it would make more sense if it began with goals/objectives and then explained the barriers or challenges to achieving those objectives and then how the proposed interventions will overcome those barriers. In the diagram presented, the challenges are at the bottom, feeding from the underlying assumptions – many of which appear to be things that the project itself should be addressing and several of them are quite significant (e.g., communities will adopt climate-smart practices, market-drive models will work, institutional strengthening will lead to improved governance, and private sector engagement will drive sustainable development). What happens to the project if one or more of these assumptions do not hold true?

Finally, STAP notes that there is potential for innovation in this project – particularly in relation to post-handling as well as the mariculture pilots. Carbon markets, digital platforms are also interesting but no detail is provided. At the same time, it is not clear what is particularly innovative about climate proofing, greening the fishery value chain and support for MSMEs, which *are* highlighted as innovative features in the project.

*Note: provide a general appraisal, asking whether relevant screening guideline questions have been addressed adequately – not all the questions will be relevant to all proposals; no need to comment on every question, only those needing more attention, noting any done very well, but ensure that all are considered. Comments should be helpful, evaluative, and qualitative, rather than yes/no.*

### 3. Specific points to be addressed, and suggestions

Based on the issues raised above, STAP recommends that the following should be addressed:

- Better articulate the concept of ‘necessary and sufficient’ and how this particular project complements other activities designed to address major problems facing the artisanal fisheries sector in Mozambique.
- Develop 2-3 simple future narratives that integrate the major drivers of vulnerability for coastal communities in Mozambique. These narratives should bring together different plausible climate, economic, and political futures (at least) to characterize the range of possible futures that this project is intended to address.
- Fully develop how an intervention and its expected outcome will deliver an adaptation benefit – and which benefits it will deliver. Increased incomes do not always result in greater adaptive capacity, as some hazards defy income (i.e. coastal inundation), so the project should articulate how, in the project context, increased incomes will lead to increased adaptive capacity and for who. Further, the project should consider the [STAP document on Adaptation Benefits](#) to identify other benefits, such as reduced sensitivity, that might be delivered by this project.
- Revise the ToC beginning with the objective, which essentially describes the project. One suggestion would be to break this down by adding a top level goal that is focused on improving adaptive capacity of the artisanal fisheries sector in the face of projected future climate impacts, and then have specific objectives that connect this goal to the outcomes listed below it, where the outcomes/components show clearly how they will contribute to achieve intended climate adaptation benefits.

*Note: number key points clearly and provide useful information or suggestions, including key literature where relevant. Completed screens should be no more than two or three pages in length.*

\*categories under review, subject to future revision

## ANNEX: STAP'S SCREENING GUIDELINES

1. How well does the proposal explain the problem and issues to be addressed in the context of the **system** within which the problem sits and its drivers (e.g. population growth, economic development, climate change, sociocultural and political factors, and technological changes), including how the various components of the system interact?
2. Does the project indicate how **uncertain futures** could unfold (e.g. using simple **narratives**), based on an understanding of the trends and interactions between the key elements of the system and its drivers?
3. Does the project describe the **baseline** problem and how it may evolve in the future in the absence of the project; and then identify the outcomes that the project seeks to achieve, how these outcomes will change the baseline, and what the key **barriers** and **enablers** are to achieving those outcomes?
4. Are the project's **objectives** well formulated and justified in relation to this system context? Is there a convincing explanation as to **why this particular project** has been selected in preference to other options, in the light of how the future may unfold?
5. How well does the **theory of change** provide an "explicit account of how and why the proposed interventions would achieve their intended outcomes and goal, based on outlining a set of key causal pathways arising from the activities and outputs of the interventions and the assumptions underlying these causal connections".
  - Does the project logic show how the project would ensure that expected outcomes are **enduring** and resilient to possible future changes identified in question 2 above, and to the effects of any conflicting policies (see question 9 below).
  - Is the theory of change grounded on a solid scientific foundation, and is it aligned with current scientific knowledge?
  - Does it explicitly consider how any necessary **institutional and behavioral** changes are to be achieved?
  - Does the theory of change diagram convincingly show the overall project logic, including causal pathways and outcomes?
6. Are the project **components** (interventions and activities) identified in the theory of change each described in sufficient detail to discern the main thrust and basis (including scientific) of the proposed solutions, how they address the problem, their justification as a robust solution, and the critical assumptions and risks to achieving them?
7. How likely is the project to generate global environmental benefits which would not have accrued without the GEF project (**additionality**)?
8. Does the project convincingly identify the relevant **stakeholders**, and their anticipated roles and responsibilities? is there an adequate explanation of how stakeholders will contribute to the

development and implementation of the project, and how they will benefit from the project to ensure enduring global environmental benefits, e.g. through co-benefits?

9. Does the description adequately explain:

- how the project will build on prior investments and complement current investments, both GEF and non-GEF,
- how the project incorporates **lessons learned** from previous projects in the country and region, and more widely from projects addressing similar issues elsewhere; and
- how country policies that are contradictory to the intended outcomes of the project (identified in section C) will be addressed (**policy coherence**)?

10. How adequate is the project's approach to generating, managing and exchanging **knowledge**, and how will lessons learned be captured for adaptive management and for the benefit of future projects?

**11. Innovation and transformation:**

- If the project is intended to be **innovative**: to what degree is it innovative, how will this ambition be achieved, how will barriers and enablers be addressed, and how might scaling be achieved?
- If the project is intended to be **transformative**: how well do the project's objectives contribute to transformative change, and are they sufficient to contribute to enduring, transformational change at a sufficient scale to deliver a step improvement in one or more GEBs? Is the proposed logic to achieve the goal credible, addressing necessary changes in institutions, social or cultural norms? Are barriers and enablers to scaling be addressed? And how will enduring scaling be achieved?

12. Have **risks** to the project design and implementation been identified appropriately in the risk table in section B, and have suitable mitigation measures been incorporated? (NB: risks to the durability of project outcomes from future changes in drivers should have been reflected in the theory of change and in project design, not in this table.)